UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/699,056	10/27/2000	Steven G. Doughty	5053-31301	6719

7590 02/07/2005

ERIC B. MEYERTONS
CONLEY, ROSE & TAYON, P.C.
P. O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER	
COLBERT, ELLA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3624	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/699,056	DOUGHTY, STEVEN G.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ella Colbert	3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 November 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *40-80* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10 November 2004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-80 are pending. Claims 40-80 have been cancelled and Group I, claims 1-39 have been elected without traverse in Response to the Election/Restriction Requirement filed 11/01/04. Claims 1-39 will be examined on the merits as set forth here below.

2. The IDS received 11/10/04 has been considered.

Abstract

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract contains more than 150 words.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1, 10-12, 22, 23, 33, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 12, 23, and 36 recite "...a transaction-related data, ...". It is unclear and vague what Applicant means by "...a transaction-related data, ...". There appears to be something missing after "data". Does Applicant mean "... transaction-related data element value, ..." or "... transaction-related data base, ..."? Claim 10, line 4 recites " ... processing key value one of the one or more data element values ...". This limitation is unclear. It is not understood what Applicant is trying to say. Does Applicant mean "... processing key value the one or more data element values ..."? Claims 11 and 22 recite "... wherein the search mask is defined by the user of the". Does Applicant mean "... wherein the search mask field is defined by the user of the"? Claims 12 and 36 recite "A system for processing FSO transactions, ...:". It is vague and unclear what kind of "system". Does Applicant mean "a computer system"?

Claim Objections

6. Claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 36, and 38 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 36, and 38 recite the acronym "FSO". Claims 1, 23, and 34 recite the acronym "FSO" in the body of the claim. This acronym should be recited as: Financial Service Organization (FSO). Claims 12 and 36 recite this acronym in the preamble. This acronym should be recited as: Financial Service Organization (FSO) in order to be in agreement with the preambles of claims 1 and 34. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims 1-8, 12-19, and 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 5,710,915) McElhiney .

Claims 1, 12, and 23, McElhiney teaches, A method performed in a Financial Service Organization (FSO) computer system, the method comprising: reading a key definition from a database (col. 1, lines 25-49 and col. 2, lines 41-45), wherein the key definition describes a location of one or more data element values in a transaction-related data (col. 2, lines 32-40 and lines 46-61), wherein the key definition is identified during a configuration of the FSO computer system (col. 4, lines 6-18 and col. 5, lines 10-29); reading from the transaction-related data the one or more data element values described in the key definition (col. 7, lines 14-48); and transferring the one or more

data element values read from the transaction-related data to a processing key value (col. 7, lines 38-48). McElhiney did not expressly teach the computer system is a Financial Service Organization computer system. However, McElhiney teaches a computer system that can be used as a Financial Service Organization computer system. A Financial Service Organization computer system is considered a design choice because any computer system that can process financial information can perform the same tasks or processes as a Financial Service Organization computer system.

Claims 2, 13, and 24, McElhiney teaches, The method of claim 1, further comprising: comparing the processing key value to one or more key values in the database (col. 4, lines 47-col. 5, line 9); and reading a processing parameter value from the database in response to finding a match between the processing key value and one of the one or more key values stored in the database (col. 5, lines 40-64); wherein the processing parameter value read from the database is configured for use in processing the transaction-related data in the FSO computer system (col. 4, lines 43-63).

Claims 3, 14, and 25, McElhiney teaches, The method of claim 2, wherein the one or more key values in the database are defined by the user of the FSO computer system during the configuration of the FSO computer system (col. 5, lines 1-17).

Claims 4, 15, and 26, McElhiney teaches, The method of claim 2, wherein the database further comprises a plurality of processing parameter tables, wherein each processing parameter table comprises one or more rows, wherein each row in the

processing parameter table comprises one processing parameter value and one key value (col. 5, line 65-col. 6, line 43).

Claims 5, 16, and 27, McElhiney teaches, The method of claim 4, wherein the key definition is one of a plurality of key definitions in the database, wherein each of the plurality of key definitions in the database is associated with one of the plurality of processing parameter tables in the database, wherein the key definition further describes a data format of the key values in the one or more rows of the processing parameter table to which the key definition is associated (col. 5, lines 42-64).

Claims 6, 17, and 28, McElhiney teaches, The method of claim 5, wherein each of the key values in the processing parameter table comprises one or more key element values (col. 5, lines 30-41).

Claims 7, 18, and 29, McElhiney teaches, The method of claim 6, wherein each of the plurality of key definitions in the database comprises one or more key elements, wherein each of the one or more key elements describes a data format of one of the one or more key element values in the key values (col. 6, lines 30-51).

Claims 8, 19, and 30, McElhiney teaches, The method of claim 1, wherein the key definition comprises one or more key elements, wherein each of the one or more key elements describes a location and data format of one of the one or more data element values in the transaction-related data (col. 2, lines 32-40 and lines 46-61). This dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as given above for claim 1.

9. Claims 9-11, 20-22, 31-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 5,710,915) McElhiney in view of (US 5,864,679) Kanai et al, hereafter Kanai.

Claims 9, 20, and 31, McElhiney failed to teach, The method of claim 1, further comprising: reading a search mask from the database, wherein the search mask comprises one or more search mask fields, wherein each of the one or more search mask fields corresponds to one of the one or more data element values described in the key definition, and wherein each of the one or more search mask fields comprises a search mask field value. Kanai teaches, reading a search mask from the database, wherein the search mask comprises one or more search mask fields, wherein each of the one or more search mask fields corresponds to one of the one or more data element values described in the key definition, and wherein each of the one or more search mask fields comprises a search mask field value (col. 48, line 31-col. 49, line 15). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to read a search mask from the database, wherein the search mask comprises one or more search mask fields, wherein each of the one or more search mask fields corresponds to one of the one or more data element values described in the key definition, and wherein each of the one or more search mask fields comprises a search mask field value. Kanai teaches, reading a search mask from the database, wherein the search mask comprises one or more search mask fields, wherein each of the one or more search mask fields corresponds to one of the one or more data element values described in the key definition, and wherein each of the one or more search

mask fields comprises a search mask field value and to combine McElhiney's search table and key values with Kanai's reading a search mask from the database comprising one or more search mask fields corresponding to one or more data element values described in the key definition and wherein each of the one or more search mask fields comprises a search mask field value because such a combination would considerably improve the performance of the database thus saving time when searching and reading from a database.

Claims 10, 21, and 32, McElhiney failed to teach, The method of claim 9, wherein the transferring the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data to the processing key value further comprises: transferring to the processing key value one of the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data in response to a search mask field value indicating that the data element value from the transaction-related data is to be written to the processing key value; and transferring to the processing key value a low collating value in response to the search mask field value indicating that the low collating value is to be written to the processing key value. Kanai teaches, wherein the transferring the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data to the processing key value further comprises: transferring to the processing key value one of the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data in response to a search mask field value indicating that the data element value from the transaction-related data is to be written to the processing key value; and transferring to the processing key value a low collating value in response to the search mask field value indicating that the low

collating value is to be written to the processing key value. Kanai teaches, wherein the transferring the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data to the processing key value further comprises: transferring to the processing key value one of the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data in response to a search mask field value indicating that the data element value from the transaction-related data is to be written to the processing key value; and transferring to the processing key value a low collating value in response to the search mask field value indicating that the low collating value is to be written to the processing key value (col. 31, lines 5-62 and col. 39, line 55-col. 40, line 11). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transfer the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data to the processing key value further comprises: transferring to the processing key value one of the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data in response to a search mask field value indicating that the data element value from the transaction-related data is to be written to the processing key value; and transferring to the processing key value a low collating value in response to the search mask field value indicating that the low collating value is to be written to the processing key value and combine McElhiney's reading a key definition from a database and key values with Kanai's transferring the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data to the processing key value further comprises: transferring to the processing key value one of the one or more data element values read from the transaction-related data in response to a search mask field value indicating that the data

element value from the transaction-related data is to be written to the processing key value; and transferring to the processing key value a low collating value in response to the search mask field value indicating that the low collating value is to be written to the processing key value would allow McElhiney and Kanai to have a transaction processing system configuration with reading access and the ability to search a field value that is conventionally arranged.

Claims 11, 22, and 33, McElhiney failed to teach, The method of claim 9, wherein the search mask is defined by the user of the FSO computer system during the configuration of the FSO computer system. Kanai teaches, wherein the search mask is defined by the user of the FSO computer system during the configuration of the FSO computer system (col. 39, line 55-col. 40, line 11 and col. 32-54). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the search mask is defined by the user of the FSO computer system during the configuration of the FSO computer system and to combine McElhiney's computer system and searching with Kanai's search mask defined by a computer system during configuration because such a combination would allow McElhiney and Kanai's systems to have a system for processing and searching transaction data in a configured computer system.

Claims 34, 36, and 38 are rejected for the similar rationale as given above for claims 1-33.

Claims 35, 37, and 39 are rejected for the similar rationale as given above for claims 3, 14, and 25.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Brandt et al (US 5,892,905) disclosed comparing a key and a key comprising any set of data.

Inquiries

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 703-308-7064. The examiner can normally be reached 6:30 AM –5:00 PM, Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1038. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

E. Colbert
February 2, 2005